

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Military Health Care: The Issue of “Promised” Benefits

Updated August 12, 2003

David F. Burrelli
Specialist in National Defense
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 12 AUG 2003		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2003 to 00-00-2003	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Military Health Care: The Issue of Promised Benefits				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, 101 Independence Ave SE, Washington, DC, 20540-7500				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 14	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Military Health Care: The Issue of “Promised” Benefits

Summary

Many military health care beneficiaries, particularly military retirees, their dependents, and those representing their interests, state that they were promised “free health care for life at military facilities” as part of their “contractual agreement” when they entered the armed forces. Efforts to locate authoritative documentation of such promises have not been successful. Congressional report language and recent court decisions have rejected retiree claims seeking ‘free care at military facilities’ as a right or entitlement. These have held that the current medical benefit structure made up of military health care facilities, Tricare and Medicare provide lifetime health care to military members, retirees and their respective dependents. Nevertheless, claims continue to be made, particularly by those seeking additional benefits from the Department of Defense, or attempting to prevent an actual or perceived reduction in benefits.

Contents

Introduction	1
Background	2
“The Promise”	3
Recent Legislation	9

Military Health Care: The Issue of “Promised” Benefits

Introduction

In recent years, numerous efforts have been made to increase, or prevent any decrease, of health care benefits and options available to military retirees. Many military retirees and others seeking these increases, or attempting to prevent any decrease in their benefits, often justify their claims based on assertions that the medical care promised to them is no longer available.¹ These retirees say that the relatively large military medical infrastructure that existed during the cold war provided greater access for retirees. They note that as a result of the reduction of the size of the Department of Defense (DOD), fewer medical facilities are available.² In certain instances, organizations representing military retirees have alluded to “broken promises.” Some individuals have claimed that these benefits include “free” health care for life, or more liberally, “free care for life in military health care facilities.”

Such contentions are not supported by a review of the legislative history of the statutory language related to military health care for retirees and dependents. These claims also have not been supported by authoritative written documentation.

In response, a number of bills have been introduced seeking to expand military health care options. In the 108th Congress, at least two of these bills (H.R. 58 and S. 56) cite a “promise” or “commitment” as the rationale for provisions that would “restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.”³ Although previous attempts to pass such legislation have failed, Congress substantially expanded the military retiree health care benefits via the FY2001 National Defense Authorization Act.⁴

¹ “About 365,000 elderly retirees and dependents—a thousand a day—will be seen by military doctors this year, Defense Department officials say.” Adde, Nick, Medical care access not difficult for all, *Army Times*, February 23, 1998: 22.

² Burrelli, David F., and Elizabeth A. Dunstan, *Military Retiree Health Care: Base Closures and Realignments*, CRS Report 95-435, March 28, 1995.

³ H.R. 58, Rep. Edwards, January 7, 2003 and S. 56, Sen. Johnson, January 7, 2003.

⁴ P.L. 106-398, Oct. 30, 2000.

Background

Under current law, active duty personnel are *entitled* to military health care and have a right or claim to this care. Active duty dependents are also *entitled* to this care, however, this entitlement is limited to space or service availability restrictions. Such an entitlement *obligates* the military to provide this care (subject to any stated restrictions such as space-availability for active duty dependents). As enforced by the Department of Defense, and interpreted by the courts, retirees and their dependents, while eligible for care on a space- or service-available basis, have no entitlement in statute to such care. In other words, they have no right to military health care and the military services have total discretion in when and under what circumstances retirees and their dependents will get care in military treatment facilities or MTFs. Historically, those dependents and retirees (under age 65) who are unable to get care at MTFs can seek care via civilian providers under DOD's Tricare benefit plan.

Tricare is the name of the health benefit plan for all military beneficiaries. Tricare is composed of three types of coverage: Prime, Extra and Standard. Tricare Prime is comparable to a Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) using the MTF as the base of health care services. Tricare Extra is similar to a Preferred Provider Organization or PPO. Finally, Tricare Standard is a fee-for-service plan (formerly known as the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services, (CHAMPUS⁵)). Active duty personnel and their dependents are automatically enrolled in Tricare Prime. Retirees (under age 65) and their dependents must enroll in Tricare Prime or seek care via Tricare Extra or Standard. Until recently, at age 65, retirees lose eligibility for Tricare and become eligible for Medicare benefits. Thus, military service provides lifetime care from a number of government-sponsored or reimbursable sources.⁶

With the passage of the FY2001 National Defense Authorization Act, beginning in October 2001, eligible military retirees over age 64 were allowed to participate in Tricare provided that they are enrolled in Medicare Part B. This new benefit is known as "Tricare for Life."

⁵ P.L. 89-614, 80 Stat. 862, September 30, 1966.

⁶ This general benefit structure is not new, nor has its consideration by Congress been a recent phenomenon. For example, see U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services, CHAMPUS and Military Health Care, Subcommittee 2, Hearings, 93rd Cong., 2nd Sess., HASC No. 93-70, October 8, 1974. Interestingly, claims of "free health care for life" did not surface in these hearings.

“The Promise”

The creation of health care benefits and the rules and regulations pertaining to these benefit are matters for Congress. Under the Constitution, Congress has the authority

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.⁷

Without explicit authorization from Congress, such benefits can not be created nor conferred by the military or others. A search of the relevant literature shows that at no time did Congress authorize rules and regulations providing “free health care for life at military facilities” for military retirees. Some have asserted that prior to 1956, the lack of legal language to the contrary allowed the military to be contractually obliged to provide “promised” care. However, under our system of government, the military does not have the constitutional authority to create such a contractual obligation. The courts (as discussed below on pages 5, 6, and 7) have held that only Congress has such authority under the Constitution.

The history of military health care shows that care provided to active duty members was originally paid for by the members as far back as 1799.⁸ In that year, Congress enacted legislation for the military establishment to care for the “regimental sick” as well as an act for the “relief of sick and disabled seamen.”⁹ Later changes provided permissive care to dependents and, later still, to retirees and their dependents. However, at no time were military retirees provided an *entitlement* to care. In 1956, Congress put the permissive nature of this benefit into law:

... a member or former member of a uniformed service who is entitled to retired or retainer pay, or equivalent pay **may**, upon request, be given medical and dental care in any facility of any uniformed service, *subject to the availability of space and facilities and the capabilities of the medical and dental staff*.¹⁰
[Emphasis added.]

In 1966, Congress created Medicare which was designed to provide health care for people over age 65 as well as certain disabled individuals. A problem arose in that military personnel tended to retire at a relatively younger age (in most cases, early- to mid-40s) and could be without guaranteed access to health care until age 65. In other words, these retirees were not entitled to military health care and were too young to participate in Medicare. In an effort to address this inability to gain access, as well as provide for those active duty dependents who could not gain access to military medical facilities, Congress created the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS). Modeled after the Blue Cross/Blue Shield high option, CHAMPUS was a fee-for-service benefit. Although

⁷ U.S. Constitution, Art. 1, Sec. 8, cl. 14.

⁸ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee No. 2, CHAMPUS and Military Health Care, 93d Cong., 2d Sess., December 20, 1974: 6.

⁹ 1 Stat. 721 and 1 Stat. 729, March 2, 1799, respectively.

¹⁰ 10 United States Code, sec. 1074(b).

it required no premiums, CHAMPUS did require cost sharing on the part of the beneficiary. Thus, CHAMPUS was not free, nor did it relate to care from MTFs. (As noted above, CHAMPUS later became part of Tricare.)

Numerous claims have been made concerning “promises” to military personnel and retirees with regard to health care benefits. Many appear to believe that they were “promised free health care for life at military facilities.” Efforts to locate written authoritative documentation of such “promises” have not been successful. However, some military recruiting literature does make general statements about health care. As an example, a recruiting brochure cited by The Retired Officers Association states:

Health care is provided to you and your family members while you are in the Army, and for the rest of your life if you serve a minimum of 20 years of Federal service to earn your retirement.¹¹

This language, of course, does not mention “free” health care. Nor does it mention that such care is to be provided via the military health services system and/or in military facilities. This advertised statement is correct in that military retirees do receive their promised lifetime benefits via MTFs (including space- or service-available care in retirement), Tricare and Medicare — all earned as a result of their federal military service.

The same source quotes a 1991 CRS report as stating that “the ‘free health care for life’ promise was functionally true and had been used to good advantage for recruiting and retention.”¹² The report is much more nuanced, and developed the analysis more deeply than this.¹³ It noted that the 1956 legislation did not authorize a legal entitlement for care to be provided to retirees and their dependents, but that the retiree and dependent population, in proportion to the available space in military health care facilities, was so low that as a practical matter, such care was usually available. It also observed that this de facto availability was, without question, a useful tool for recruiters. The end result appears to be that, regardless of the lack of statutory entitlement, many active duty personnel and their dependents, and retirees and their dependents, erroneously came to believe that they were guaranteed free health care in military facilities for life.

Other sources have noted that such promises, whether or not actually made, are groundless. For example, in responding to questions from Congress concerning what benefits were promised, Rear Admiral Harold M. Koenig, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs, sought to clarify a statement made by Vice Admiral Hagen concerning these benefits. Rear Admiral Koenig stated in 1993 that:

¹¹ Army brochure cited and reproduced in *The Retired Officers Association Magazine*, April 1996.

¹² The Retired Officers Association, April 1996. This CRS report was also similarly represented in Roberts, C.R., “Veterans Call It The Big Lie,” *The American Legion*, October 1995: 18. The article is based on excerpts from *The News Tribune*, Tacoma, WA, by the same author.

¹³ Best, Dick, Memo to Congress, Promises of Lifetime Medical Care, April 21, 1997.

There is a problem here of interpretation. [Vice Admiral Donald Hagen, Medical Corps Surgeon General, U.S. Navy] said medical care for life. That is true. We have a medical care program for the life of our beneficiaries, and it is pretty well defined in the law. That easily gets interpreted to, or reinterpreted into, free medical care for the rest of your life. That is a pretty easy transition for people to make in their thinking, and it is pervasive. We spend an incredible amount of effort trying to reeducate people that that is not their benefit.¹⁴

According to the Department of Defense, “[a]s thus formulated, medical care for retirees in military medical facilities has always been, and to this day remains, a privilege, not an absolute right, as has been assumed by many.”¹⁵

The federal courts have repeatedly held that such claims of a “promise” have no legal standing. In late 1997, a U.S. District Court dismissed a lawsuit by retirees against the U.S. seeking “free health care” from the military. According to the court:

The court must reject plaintiffs’ contention that [10 United States Code sec. 1074(b)] confers authority on the military branches to guarantee free lifetime medical care to retirees and their dependents. First, plaintiffs cite to no regulation under sec. 1074(b) guaranteeing such care, but only cite to recruiting materials that make general representations as to eligibility for continued health care for retirees and their dependents. Even if the military departments had promulgated regulations under sec. 1074(b) that make an unequivocal promise of lifetime medical care for retirees and their dependents, the language of sec. 1074(b) itself is clearly conditional. Any regulations purporting to guarantee free and unconditional lifetime health care to retirees and their dependents would be inconsistent with the statute and therefore invalid. *Larionoff*, 431 U.S. at 873 n.13 (“A regulation which ... operates to create a rule out of harmony with the statute ... is a mere nullity.”) (citing *Manhattan General Equip. Co. V. Commissioner*, 297 U.S. 129, 134 (1936)).

Furthermore, under sec. 1074(b), “a retired member of a uniformed service is not entitled to medical care as a matter of right,” *Lord v. United States*, 2 Cl. Ct. 749, 756 (1983), and “retired personnel who fail to receive such care cannot successfully maintain an action for money damages based on such failure.” *Id.* At 757; see also *Watt v. United States*, 246 F. Supp. 386, 388 (E.D.N.Y. 1965) (“furnishing [medical care in a military facility] to a retired soldier is discretionary, not mandatory”). Because the law states that retirees are not entitled to health care as a matter of right, the representations upon which plaintiffs rely are to no effect.¹⁶

¹⁴ U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994, H.R. 2401, Hearings, 103rd Cong., 1st Sess., H.Rept. 103-13, April 27, 28, May 10, 11, and 13, 1993: 505.

¹⁵ U.S. Department of Defense, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Military Compensation Background Papers, Fifth Edition, September 1996: 609.

¹⁶ Coalition of Retired Military Veterans, et al. v. United States of America, U.S. Dist. of South Carolina, C.A.#2:96-3822-23, Dec. 10, 1997: 11-12.

With respect to the contention that recruiters and others allegedly made “promises of free care for life,” and that such “promises” must be honored by the government, the court notes:

Federal officials who by act or word generate expectations in the people they employ, and then disappoint them, do not *ipso facto* create a contract liability running from the Federal Government to the employee¹⁷

In a separate case (*Schism and Reinlie v. U.S.*), another federal judge found military “retirees 65 and older do not have a binding contract with the Pentagon that guarantees them free health care for life at military hospitals.”¹⁸

In 1999, a federal appeals court stated:

Nothing in these regulations provided for unconditional lifetime free medical care or authorized recruiters to promise such care as an inducement to joining or continuing in the armed forces. While the Retirees argue that the above mentioned section 4132.1 gave those of them who served as officers in the Navy and Marine Corps the right to free unconditional medical care, we cannot agree. The [1922 Manual of the Medical Department of the United States Navy] Manual provided guidelines for the Navy’s Medical Department, but did not create any right in such officers to the free unconditional lifetime medical care they claim. It related only to hospital care, not the broader services that these Retirees seek, and covered only the period when it was in effect. In any event, in view of the general pattern of the military regulations that provides medical care to retirees only when facilities and personnel were available, we decline to read into the creation of such an enduring and broad right to unconditional free lifetime medical care.

In sum, we conclude that the Retirees have not shown that they have a right to the health care they say was “taken” by the government. Since the basic premise of their claim fails, their taking claim necessarily also fails.¹⁹

On December 8, 1999, the Coalition of Retired Military Veterans appealed their case to the Supreme Court.²⁰ The Supreme Court denied the petition to review the lower court ruling on April 17, 2000.²¹

¹⁷ *Coalition v. U.S.*: 15-16.

¹⁸ Adde, Nick, Judge: lifetime care is no guarantee, *Army Times*, Sept. 21, 1998: 10. An appeal in this case is anticipated. *Schism and Reinlie v. U.S.* No. #:96cv349/RV United States District Court, N.D. Florida, June 10, 1997.

¹⁹ *Sebastain v. United States*, 185 F.3d 1368, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 1999). An appeal of this decision is pending.

²⁰ Adde, Nick, Retirees head to Supreme Court, *The Times*, January 10, 2000: 14.

²¹ *Sebastian v. U.S.*, 529 U.S. 1065, 120 S.Ct. 1669, 146 L.Ed.2d 479, 68 USLW 3391, 68 USLW 3655 (U.S., Apr. 17, 2000)(NO. 99-977). Summary of Orders: “Neither statutes nor regulations ever authorized armed services to promise free lifetime medical care to enlistees, and thus claim by now-retired members of the armed services that new regulations that diminish medical care previously available for military retirees constitute compensable (continued...)”

On February 8, 2001, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit reversed the lower court ruling (*Schism and Reinlie v. U.S.*) declaring "... the government breached its implied-in-fact contract with retirees when it failed to provide them with health care benefits."²² The appeals court reversed the district court decision and remanded the case for a determination of damages. Despite various claims, this finding applied only to the two named plaintiffs (and not to all military retirees), and no determination of damages was made. (Some have erroneously reported that the ruling "would have required the government to pay to three million retirees, widows and dependents up to \$10,000 apiece."²³) On June 13, 2001, the Appeals Court vacated the judgment, withdrew its opinion, and agreed to rehear the appeal en banc. As stated "[t]he court has determined to rehear this case en banc to resolve the question of whether the promises of free lifetime care made to and accepted by Plaintiffs-Appellants should be afforded binding effect."²⁴

On November 18, 2002, the U.S. Court of Appeals (voting 9-4) stated:

In the end, because no actual authority existed for the recruiters' promises of full free lifetime medical care, the plaintiffs cannot show a valid implied-in-fact contract. Thus, the plaintiffs' claim must fail as a matter of law.²⁵

On June 2, 2003, the Supreme Court denied the petition to review this case as well.²⁶

The claim of "free" or "promised" care is often reported in the media or by lobbying groups. Some media sources have contradicted the notion of free health care for life.²⁷ Conversely, others appear to accept or support the existence of such "promises." Although these sources have no legal authority to effect such claims, their repetition of these so-called promises may serve to create or reinforce the notion of the existence of such "promises."²⁸

²¹ (...continued)

taking is meritless." *Sebastian v. United States*, 68 USLW. 3649 (April 18, 2000). Note: citations to this case make reference to different titles including, *Coalition of Retired Military Veterans*, *CORMV*, *CRMV*, or *Sebastain and Sebastian, v. U.S. or United States*.

²² *Schism and Reinlie v. U.S.*, 2001 U.S. App., 239 F.3d 1280, Feb. 8, 2001.

²³ *Armed Forces News*, [<http://www.armedforcesnews.com/backissues/2001/062201.htm>] June 22, 2001.

²⁴ *Schism and Reinlie v. U.S.* 2001 WL 664440 (Fed. Cir. (Fla)), June 13, 2001.

²⁵ *Schism and Reinlie v. United States*, 2002 WL 31549178 (Fed.Cir.(Fla.)), November 18, 2002.

²⁶ *Schism and Reinlie v. United States*, 123 S.Ct. 2246; 156 L.Ed.2d 125; 2003 U.S. LEXIS 4404; 71 USLW 3750, June 2, 2003.

²⁷ Hamby, James E., Jr., 'Free care for life is a myth,' *Air Force Times*, September 20, 1993: 18.

²⁸ See, for example, Rich, Spencer, *Military Health Care Downsizing Leaves Retirees in a Bind*, *Washington Post*, July 30, 1996: A11; Editorials, *Veterans should not be force to pay* (continued...)

Notably, certain former recruiters claim to have made such promises. They may well have. Nevertheless, as pointed out above, unauthorized promises based on mistakes, fraud, etc., do not constitute a contractual obligation on the part of the government/taxpayer.

In a different vein, others suggest that although no such *legal* entitlement exists, a *moral* obligation or an obligation based on popular opinion is sufficiently compelling to make such a promise a reality. For example, Hon. Stephen Joseph, former Assistant Secretary of Defense (Health Affairs) stated before a congressional subcommittee in 1995:

The lawyers will tell you that there is no fine print that says free medical care guaranteed for life. I think though it is facetious for anybody to sit up here and say that, that is not what recruits believe when they are talked to by their recruiter. That is a fact of life.²⁹

Whether there is or should be a moral obligation is a matter of opinion; as decided by the courts and enforced by the administrators, these claims, like the others, do not create a contractual obligation on the part of the government/taxpayer. The courts, and other analysts, have noted that allowing these claims to create such an obligation would thwart the constitutional role of Congress (i.e., prevent the Congress from determining the compensation and benefits of the armed forces) and create a situation wherein military personnel/retirees (and potentially all other federal employees) could create or expand their own benefits with popular myth or rumor and without review.

Despite extensive documentation, including court decisions, to the contrary, the belief in legally guaranteed “free lifetime care” persists,³⁰ and such claims continue color debate over the availability of these and other military health care benefits.³¹

²⁸ (...continued)

for ‘free’ health care, Kerrville Daily Times, December 8, 1997: 4A; “... the promise of free health care in their later years was a major enticement to stay for a full career.”, AFSA Calls for Tricare Reform, Sergeants, November 1995: 9; Kaczor, Bill, AP, Miami Herald, Military Retirees Appealing Benefits Denial, December 12, 1998: “At the heart of the matter is a 1956 law that permits free care for retirees at military hospitals and clinics but only on a space[-]available basis.” and, Joyce, Terry, Network Offers Health Care Answers For Military Families, Charleston Post and Courier, January 9, 2000, “Folks who are upset about care that’s no longer available or cash outlays for what was supposed to be free.”

²⁹ U.S. Congress. House. National Security Committee, Military Personnel Subcommittee, Hearings, Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs, 104th Cong., 1st Sess., H.Rept 104-7, March 28, 1995: 828. The Retired Officer Association also credits Dr. Joseph with testifying (in 1995) “before Congress that DoD has an ‘implied moral commitment’ to provide health care to all eligible beneficiaries.”

³⁰ See U.S. Congress. House. National Security Committee, Military Personnel Subcommittee, Hearings on National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998-H.R. 1119 and Oversight of Previously Authorized Programs. HNSC No. 105-6, 105th Cong., 1st Sess., Feb. 27, 1997: 1-162, for a lengthy treatment of this issue.

³¹ For example, an insert in *The Retired Officer Magazine*, January 1998, seeking FEHBP (continued...)

Recent Legislation

Though Congress has never authorized “free health care for life at military facilities,” various congressional reports have commented on the issue, and there have been recent legislative actions on the subject. For example, the Senate, explaining its support of additional benefits for military retirees, included non-binding language in its report on the fiscal year 1998 National Defense Authorization Act that reiterated its intention with regard to the promise of lifetime care:

A longstanding priority of the committee has been the improvement of the military health care system

[T]he committee is concerned that the Department of Defense (DOD) faces significant constraints on its ability to meet the entire range of benefits expected by participants in the Military Health Service System

The issue of health care for military retirees over age 65 is of special concern to the committee. The nation has incurred a moral obligation to attempt to provide care to military retirees who believe they were promised lifetime health care in exchange for a lifetime of military service. The nation fulfills its obligation through Medicare.³²

Here, the Senate is clearly expressing its view that a “promise” to military retirees was made — and that existing statutes and institutions do fulfill that promise.

Later, with the enactment of the FY1998 National Defense Authorization Act, Congress included the following language:

SEC. 752. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING QUALITY HEALTH CARE FOR RETIREES

(a) Findings.-Congress makes the follow findings:

(1) Many retired military personnel believe that they were promised lifetime health care in exchange for 20 or more years of service.

(2) Military retirees are the only Federal Government personnel who have been prevented from using their employer-provided health care at or after 65 years of age.

(3) Military health care has become increasingly difficult to obtain for military retirees as the Department of Defense reduces its health care infrastructure.

(4) Military retirees deserve to have a health care program that is at least comparable with that of retirees from civilian employment by the Federal Government.

³¹ (...continued)

benefits for military retirees over 65, is entitled, “FEHBP-65: The fix for broken health care promise.” According to the U.S. General Accounting Office, a demonstration project affording military retirees access to FEHBP coverage suffered low enrollment. The demonstration was ultimately terminated. US GAO, GAO-03-547, June 2003.

³² U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Armed Services, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998, 105th Cong., 1st Sess., S.Rept. 105-29, S. 924, June 17, 1997: 294-5.

(5) The availability of quality, lifetime health care is a critical recruiting incentive for the Armed Forces.

(6) Quality health care is a critical aspect of the quality of life of the men and women serving in the Armed Forces.

(B) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.- It is the sense of the Congress that-

(1) the United States has incurred a moral obligation to provide health care to members and former members of the Armed Forces who are entitled to retired or retainer pay (or its equivalent);

(2) it is, therefore, necessary to provide quality, affordable health care to such retirees; and,

(3) Congress and the President should take steps to address the problems associated with the availability of health care for such retirees within two years after the date of the enactment of this Act.³³

Although this language is also non-binding, it does give a sense of the rationale behind creating additional benefits for retirees.³⁴

Some in Congress would like to go further in clarifying the issue. On August 6, 1998, Representative Jo Ann Emerson introduced legislation that would have established a “Medicare eligible military retiree health care consensus task force.” Among its proposed duties, this task force would conduct “a comprehensive legal and factual study of ... [p]romises, commitments, or representations made to members of the Uniformed Service by Department of Defense personnel with respect to health care coverage of such members and their families after separation from the Uniformed Services.”³⁵ The twelve-member task force (including representatives of military retiree organizations) would determine what had been promised to military members and to what extent these promises were binding. This legislation was reintroduced in the 107th and 108th Congresses.³⁶

One reported response to this legislation by an unidentified representative of a military retiree organization was somewhat muted, suggesting that “... we are really beyond the point of looking at broken promises. We are at the stage now where Congress knows something has to be done and is just trying to decide what to do.”³⁷ The legislation was referred to committee but was not reported out of committee prior to adjournment.

³³ P.L. 105-85, Sec. 752, November 18, 1997.

³⁴ These additional benefits include the creation of demonstration projects known as Medicare Subvention and a Federal Employees Health Benefits Program option. In addition, Congress has instructed DOD to insure an improved pharmaceutical benefit for eligible beneficiaries. For additional information, see CRS Issue Brief IB93103, *Military Medical Care: Questions and Answers*, by Richard Best, updated regularly.

³⁵ H.R. 4464, August 6, 1998: 2.

³⁶ H.R. 67, January 3, 2001, and H.R. 62, January 7, 2003.

³⁷ Cited as “a representative of a major military organization” lobbying for improved medical care for military retirees; see Maze, Rick, A Broken Promise, *Navy Times*, August 24, 1998: 24.

As noted above, H.R. 58 and S. 56 were introduced on January 7, 2003. Among their provisions, H.R. 58 and S. 56 seek to expand military retiree health care options to include access to the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. In offering these benefits, these bills present a number of “findings” (some of which appear inconsistent with the official history of military medical care). For example, H.R. 58 and S. 56 find that:

Statutes enacted in 1956 entitled those who entered service on or after June 7, 1956, and retired after serving a minimum of 20 years or by reason of a service-connected disability, to medical and dental care in any facility of the uniformed services, subject to the availability of space and facilities and the capabilities of the medical and dental staff.

In addition to not being consistent with the statute, the Department of Defense has always maintained that military retiree health care is, and always has been, permissive in nature and therefore not an entitlement.

As noted above, although none of these bills was enacted, Congress substantially expanded the health care benefits available to military retirees via the FY2001 National Defense Authorization Act. Among its provisions, this legislation provides an enhanced pharmacy benefit and, with certain restrictions, it extends Tricare coverage to those age 65 and older (known as “Tricare for Life”). For additional information, see CRS Issue Brief IB93103, *Military Medical Care Services: Questions and Answers*, by Richard Best, updated regularly.